

# THE CRISIS.

Devoted to the Support of the Democratic Principles of Jefferson.

"Union, harmony, self-denial, concession---everything for the Cause, nothing for Men."

No. 28.

RICHMOND, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1840.

Vol. I.

## POLITICS.

ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE OF THE SLAVEHOLDING STATES, BY THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF CONGRESS FROM THOSE STATES.

At a meeting of the Democratic Republican Senators and Representatives in the Twenty-sixth Congress from the slaveholding States, held in the Capitol of the U. S. on the 20th of July, 1840, the Hon. William R. King of the Senate was called to the chair, and the Hon. Jesse A. Bynum of the House of Representatives, appointed secretary. Thereupon, the committee of one member from each of the said States, heretofore appointed for the purpose, through Mr. Clay of Alabama, reported an address, to be submitted to the people of the slaveholding States, in reference to which, after consideration, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That one member from each of the aforesaid States be instructed to sign and publish the same. Whereupon the meeting adjourned.

WILLIAM R. KING,  
Chairman.

J. A. BYNUM, Secretary.

TO THE PEOPLE OF THE SLAVEHOLDING STATES.

It is not as members of a political party that we now address you. A crisis has arrived in the affairs of this country, which, with Southern men, makes the interests of party, important as they are, a secondary consideration. The current of events is fast hastening to the point where it must be determined, not whether the country shall be governed according to the principles of the Federal or Democratic creed, but whether, in a large portion of the Union, society shall exist at all in its present organization.

It is an established principle with the whole human family, that one association, or society, cannot justly interfere with another, in reference to the institutions under which it chooses to be governed, and that, in this particular, each is sovereign and independent. Much less are one society, or the individuals of one society, responsible to Heaven or Earth for the justice or expediency of the institutions of another. In Europe, the right of foreign intervention has been for years the dividing question between the friends of freedom and the advocates of hereditary kings and absolute power. To maintain the right of interference and force on unwilling nations, hereditary dominion, under the name of legitimacy, was the grand object of the Holy Alliance. The combined monarchs denied to the people any rights which were not obtained from the voluntary concessions of kings and princes, and undertook to put down, by armed intervention, all uprisings of the great mass of society, with a view to modify the Government in conformity with the general will. The friends of freedom on the one hand, maintained that the people of each nation have a right to change their institutions at will—that one has no right, in that respect, to interfere with another; and that an absolute independence in each nation, of all foreign interposition and control, is the only safeguard of liberty among mankind. Twice did the Holy Alliance impose a legitimate Monarch on France; but, after witnessing the devotion of her people during the three glorious days of 1830, they dared not attempt to repeat the experiment.

By the Revolution of 1776, each of the United States acquired a right to separate and absolute independence as a nation, and a right to mould its institutions according to the will of its own people. And this was all that it acquired. Virginia did not acquire a right to dictate a Constitution or laws to Massachusetts, nor Massachusetts to Virginia. The people of Virginia did not become responsible for the institutions of Massachusetts nor the people of Massachusetts for those of Virginia. Each was a separate and independent State, and the people of each acquired the right to control their own institutions, and became alone responsible for their justice and expediency.

Some of the States abolished slavery, and others did not. From this circumstance arose one of those diversities in human society which pervade the earth. Whether this diversity was so great as to forbid a Confederacy or any sort of union among the States, was a question which the patriots of that day considered and decided. They considered, that, notwithstanding this and other diversities, there were other great points upon which the whole had a sympathy and interest. All had an interest in preserving peace between each other; in protection against foreign aggression; in freedom of commerce among them-

selves; in the inviolability of contracts; in an uniform currency; in the preservation of the public faith, and in other general measures and principles conducive to the prosperity and happiness of man in all societies and under all circumstances. To refuse to unite with their brethren, under a benign authority embracing only these points of common interest, leaving all else absolutely to the several States, appeared to the men of that day as foolish as to repudiate the government of their great Creator, because it embraces the tyrant and his victim, the freeman and the slave, nations where half society are in bondage, as well as nations where all are free—as ridiculous as to hide from the light of the sun, and reject the genial rain, because they descend alike upon the evil and the good, on the unjust as well as the just. Nor did they conceive that, by entering into a Confederacy with limited powers, they made their several co-States, or the people thereof, responsible for the institutions and laws of other States, growing out of their reserved rights and powers, any more than they are responsible for the institutions and laws of the nations of Europe, Asia, or Africa, with whom they are united by the laws of Heaven and the laws of nations, if not by treaties of commerce or alliance.

The power to regulate or abolish the institution of slavery in the States which we represent, was reserved by them absolutely when they entered into the Federal compact. The other States, and the people thereof, have no more right to interfere with it than they have with the same institution in the nations of Africa or Asia. Nay, more: they cannot interfere with it without violating their national faith as pledged in the compact, which, to a certain extent, makes us one people. The Constitution of the United States recognizes the institution, and binds all the States and the people thereof to protect it, in the same manner as they are bound to protect every other institution which exists under the legitimate authority of the State Governments. In attacking the institution of slavery in Asia or Africa, the people of the United States would be guilty of an unwarrantable interference with the affairs of other nations—in attacking that institution as it exists in any of these confederated States, they are not only guilty of an unwarrantable interference, but commit a palpable breach of their pledged faith. Yet these attacks have been made and repeated with a zeal and perseverance worthy of a better cause. Vast associations have been formed, extending over a large portion of the Union, and having connections in foreign countries, for the avowed purpose of attacking the institution of slavery, not in the States where the associations exist, but in other States whose local affairs and institutions they have no interest or concern. Those associations have become powerful in money and in men, and control a considerable number of presses, which are zealous in disseminating their doctrines and strengthening their organization.

The duty of all friends of the rights of the States, as well as the union of the States, in relation to this fanatical sect, is too obvious to be mistaken. It is to have no connection with them, having reference to the administration of the Government; but to leave them wholly to themselves. Separated from the great parties which divide the country, and acting without countenance or encouragement from either, their extravagance and the unsoundness of their principles would check their increase and obviate all danger from their assaults upon Southern society and the principles of the Constitution. Unfortunately, this course has not been pursued. On the contrary, their aid has been sought and their support secured in the party struggles of the times; they have been courted, encouraged, and by these means strengthened, until they aspire to the high places in the General Government and expect at no distant day to wield its power.

It is a matter of the highest importance to the slaveholding States to know and mark the party and the individuals who are thus encouraging the hopes, strengthening the hands, and administering to the designs of the Abolitionists. It behooves our people, as they value their property, their liberty, and their lives, to look at this matter uninfluenced by party considerations, determined only to know the truth, and do their duty to themselves. Of what importance is it to them whether we have a National Bank or not; a protective Tariff or not; Internal Improvement or not; if a faction shall obtain a controlling power in the Government which shall rob them of their property, desolate their fields, destroy their dwellings, and mas-

sacre their families? This subject transcends and supercedes all others; and the first question a Southern man ought to ask, when he is solicited to attach himself to any party, or vote for any candidate, is, will it in any way encourage the hopes, or increase the strength of the Abolitionists? We request each one of you, to whatever party you may have heretofore belonged, to ask yourself this question, and determine to be governed by the answer which truth shall give to it.

That Northern men, generally, entertain opinions adverse to slavery, and regard it as a great moral evil may be admitted. Many of both the great political parties may agree in abstract opinions on the subject of slavery; but there is, to us, a most important difference in other respects. The Democrats of the North, as a party, are opposed to any action upon the subject by the General Government, whatever may be their abstract opinions; while the Whigs in that section of the Union, as a party, are almost universally the ally of the Abolitionists in their active measures, as exhibited in the Congress of the United States, and in the State Legislatures. In support of this assertion we call your serious attention to the following facts:

### ABOLITION IN CONGRESS.

At the December session of Congress, 1836, the following resolutions, offered by Mr. Pinckney of South Carolina, were adopted by the House of Representatives, viz:

"1. Resolved, That Congress possesses no constitutional authority to interfere in any way with the institution of slavery in any of the States of this Confederacy.

"2. Resolved, That Congress ought not to interfere in any way with slavery in the District of Columbia.

"3. Resolved, That all petitions, memorials, propositions, resolutions, or papers, relating in any way, or to any extent whatever, to the subject of slavery, or the Abolition of slavery, shall, without being either printed or referred, be laid upon the table, and that no further action whatever shall be had thereon."

The party vote on these resolutions was as follows, according to as accurate a classification as can be made, viz:

Nine only voted against the first resolution—all Northern Whigs.

FOR THE SECOND RESOLUTION.		AGAINST IT.	
Northern Democrats	67	Northern Democrats	9
Northern Whigs	4	Northern Whigs	34
Southern Democrats	35	Southern Democrats	00
Southern Whigs	28	Southern Whigs	00

\* Yeas 134 Nays 43

FOR THE THIRD RESOLUTION.		AGAINST IT.	
Northern Democrats	62	Northern Democrats	17
Northern Whigs	1	Northern Whigs	43
Southern Democrats	33	Southern Democrats	3
Southern Whigs	23	Southern Whigs	3

Yeas 119 Nays 66

Some of the Southern votes on the last resolution were governed by the opinion that the resolution technically admitted the reception of the petitions, to which they were opposed in every shape, while it is not known or believed that a single Northern vote was governed by that consideration.

At the next session of Congress a resolution similar to the above was adopted by a similar vote.

At the session of 1837-8, a direct proposition was made by Mr. Slade, a leading Whig from Vermont, to refer an Abolition petition to a select committee, "with instructions to report a bill providing for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia." Much excitement ensued, and the House finally adopted the following resolution, prepared by a meeting of Southern members and reported by Mr. Patton, viz:

"Resolved, That all petitions, memorials, and papers touching the Abolition of slavery, or buying, selling, or the transferring slaves in any State, District, or Territory, of the U. S., be laid upon the table without being debated, printed, read, or referred, and that no further action whatever shall be had thereon."

The party vote on this resolution was as follows, viz:

FOR THE RESOLUTION.		AGAINST IT.	
Northern Democrats	51	Northern Democrats	15
Northern Whigs	1	Northern Whigs	59
Southern Democrats	36	Southern Democrats	0
Southern Whigs	34	Southern Whigs	0

Yeas 122 Nays 74

At the next session of Congress, a series of five reso-



lutions was introduced in reference to this subject, and finally adopted by similar party votes.

The question upon the reception of Abolition petitions came up at the last session on a motion to amend the rules of the House, by incorporating in them the substance of the resolution adopted at the session of 1837-'8, at the instance of the Southern members of all parties, in the following words, viz:

"All petitions, memorials, and papers, touching the abolition of slavery, or the buying, selling or the transferring of slaves in any State, District, or Territory of the U. S., shall, upon their presentation, be laid on the table, without being debated, printed, read, or referred, and no further action whatever shall be had thereon."

Upon a motion to lay this proposition on the table, the yeas were 102, the nays 96.

FOR THE MOTION.		AGAINST IT.	
Northern Democrats	9	Northern Democrats	54
Northern Whigs	61	Northern Whigs	00
Southern Democrats	9	Southern Democrats	30
Southern Whigs	23	Southern Whigs	12

Yeas 102 Nays 96

After much agitation on the subject, the following resolution was adopted, viz:

"That no petition, memorial, resolution, or other paper, praying the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, or any State or Territory, or the slave trade between the States or Territories of the U. S. in which it now exists, shall be received by this House, or entertained in any way whatever."

FOR THIS RESOLUTION.		AGAINST IT.	
Northern Democrats	27	Northern Democrats	38
Northern Whigs	1	Northern Whigs	64
Southern Democrats	46	Southern Democrats	00
Southern Whigs	38	Southern Whigs	4

Yeas 112 Nays 106

It will be seen, that at this session the compact front of the South was broken, which may justly be considered as the first fruits of the political coalition which produced the nominations at Harrisburg.

The result of the last Congressional elections in the Northern, Middle, and Northwestern States, was to make the Whigs and Abolitionists from these States but one party in Congress, acting in the most perfect harmony in most of their votes and proceedings.

The conduct of the parties in the several State Legislatures has been in perfect correspondence with the exhibitions made by them in Congress.

#### MAINE.

The Abolitionists of Maine petitioned the Legislature of that State in 1838-9, to take steps to effect the Abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and prevent the admission of any new State into the Union, with a Constitution tolerating slavery. These petitions were referred to a committee, a majority of whom were opposed to any action upon the subject; but a minority made a long report, terminating with the following resolutions, viz:

"Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be requested to use their utmost efforts to prevent the admission of any new State into the Union, whose Constitution tolerates domestic slavery."

"Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be requested to use their utmost efforts to prevent the admission of any new State into the Union, whose Constitution tolerates domestic slavery."

The only question taken in relation to the report and resolutions, was, upon a motion to print, which was negatived—yeas 76, nays 77. Of the 76 yeas, 59 were Whigs and 17 Democrats: Of the nays, two only were Whigs and 75 Democrats.

#### NEW HAMPSHIRE.

The Legislature of the Democratic State of New Hampshire, on the 13th day of January, 1837, and again on the 5th July, 1839, adopted resolutions upon this subject, fully sustaining the rights of the South. We annex the last of the resolutions marked A, as introduced and passed by the Democratic party in the Legislature of that patriotic State.

We know not by what vote those of 1837 were adopted; but by an extract from the journal, we find that those of 1839, except the fourth, were carried without a division. The fourth resolution was adopted by 137 yeas to 69 nays. Of the 137 yeas, 134 were Democrats, and 3 Whigs; of the 69 nays, 1 was a Democrat, and 68 Whigs.

#### RHODE ISLAND.

In the Rhode Island Legislature on the 23d January, 1839, a preamble and resolutions were introduced, which we annex, marked B, condemning the resolutions of the United States House of Representatives, adopted on the 11th and 12th of the preceding December, providing for laying Abolition petitions on the table. Upon motion, these resolutions were laid on the table, by a vote of 35 to 30. Of the 35 yeas, 23 were Democrats, and 12 Whigs. Of the nays, 2 were Democrats, and 28 Whigs.

In Connecticut, the Whig party, having the ascendancy in the Legislature in 1838, adopted resolutions favorable to the views of the Abolitionists, which we hereto annex, marked C. At their last session, the Legislature referred the subject of Abolition to a com-

mittee, a majority of which was made up of Democrats. They made a strong report with resolutions, against the object of the Abolition petitioners, which the Whig majority of the Legislature refused even to print, and they were left on the table. The resolutions we hereto annex, marked D.

Vermont has long been equally celebrated as a Whig and Abolition State. In November, 1837, the Legislature of that State adopted resolutions, in conformity with the views of the Abolitionists, which we hereto annex, marked E. We are not informed how individuals belonging to the two great parties voted; but as the Whigs had a decisive majority on their side, we have no doubt that the resolutions were carried almost exclusively by their vote. (See notes 1 and 2.)

#### PENNSYLVANIA.

In Pennsylvania the views of the two parties are distinctly marked by their course in the Convention of 1838, to amend the Constitution of the State. In that body two questions were raised bearing on this subject:

1. A proposition so to amend the Constitution, as to extend the right of trial by jury to fugitive slaves.

2. A proposition so to amend the Constitution, as to extend the right of suffrage to negroes.

On the day the standing committees of the convention were announced, and its business organized, Mr. Thaddeus Stevens, a leading Whig delegate, offered the following resolution, viz:

"Resolved, That article 9, item 6, of the Bill of Rights, be made to read as follows: 'The trial by jury shall remain as heretofore, and shall be secured to every human being, in all cases where his life or liberty is in question; and the right thereof shall remain inviolate.'"

This resolution was laid on the table.

The movement thus commenced in the Convention, was promptly seconded by the presentation of petitions having the same object; and the journal shows that between the motion of Mr. Stevens and the next movement in the convention on the subject, fifty-five petitions, calling upon that body to introduce the proposed amendment in the Constitution, were presented. Of these petitions, fifty-two were presented by Whigs, and three by Democrats.

At the second session of the Convention, after the preceding petitions had been presented, Mr. Joseph Konigsmacker, also a leading Whig delegate, again brought the subject up, by offering the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the 9th article of the Constitution be referred to the committee appointed to prepare and engross the amendments for a third reading, and that they be directed to report an amendment to said article, providing that the right of trial by jury may be extended to every human being, and that the said committee be directed to prepare and engross said article for a third reading."

This resolution was also laid upon the table.

In the following month, the subject was a third time brought up by Mr. James C. Biddle, also a leading Whig delegate from Philadelphia, who offered the following resolution:

"To amend the sixth section (relative to the trial by jury) by adding to the end thereof the words which follow, to wit: 'It shall be granted to all persons who may be arrested as fugitives from labor, and who shall claim to be freemen.'"

This resolution was advocated by the mover in a long and animated speech, and gave rise to considerable debate. It was resisted with much eloquence as an infringement of the constitutional compact with the South, especially by Mr. Woodward and Mr. Ingersoll, two of the leading Democratic members.

The resolution was finally rejected by a vote of 76 to 39. Of the 76 voting against it, 61 were Democrats and 15 Whigs; of the 39 voting for it, 2 were Democrats and 37 Whigs.

The proposition was twice renewed afterwards by leading Whigs, and finally, after long discussion, in which the Whigs supported, and the Democrats opposed it, it was again rejected, 36 voting for it; of whom 33 were Whigs and 3 Democrats; and 72 voting against it; of whom 61 were Democrats and 11 Whigs.

The old Constitution of Pennsylvania did not expressly exclude negroes from the right of suffrage. In the convention, Mr. John B. Sterigere, a leading Democrat, offered a resolution proposing, among other things, an amendment declaring that "every free white male" of the age, &c., shall enjoy the right of suffrage; and afterwards Mr. Andrew Bedford, another Democrat, proposed a similar amendment. The committee on that part of the Constitution, a majority being Whigs, reported the section admitting "every freeman," &c., to the right of suffrage, omitting the word *white*. The Committee of the Whole, to which the proposition was referred, reported in favor of leaving the Constitution, in that respect, as it then stood. Mr. Thaddeus Stevens and Mr. John Dickey, both leading Whigs, proposed amendments admitting negro suffrage.

The subject was not acted on for some weeks, during which seventy-one memorials were presented against negro suffrage, 66 by Democrats and 5 by Whigs; and 33 in favor of negro suffrage, 3 by Democrats and 30 by Whigs. One of these memorials was from the negroes of Philadelphia, which the Convention refused to print, 44 Whigs and 6 Democrats voting for the motion.

When the subject again came up, Mr. Benjamin Martin, a Democrat, moved to amend by inserting the

word "white" before "freemen," thereby excluding negroes. The reports show that Messrs. Brown, Cummin, Fleming, Fuller, McCahen, Martin, Payne, Sterigere, Sturdevant, and Woodward, Democrats, and Judge Hopkinson, Whig, supported the amendment, and that Messrs. Agnew, Biddle, Chandler, Chauncey, Darlington, Dickey, Forward, Maclay, Montgomery, and Reigard, Whigs, and Messrs. Earl and Farely, Democrats, opposed it. The amendment was adopted after several day's discussion, 41 Whigs and 4 Democrats voting against it.

Mr. Scott, a Whig delegate, then offered an amendment proposing to vest in the Legislature power to admit negroes to the right of suffrage after the year 1860, which was rejected, 33 Whigs and three Democrats voting against it.

Five successive attempts were made by Whigs to admit negroes to the right of suffrage, which were voted down, the Whigs giving for them from 26 to 39 votes, and the Democrats never more than three. Finally the total exclusion was carried by a vote of 88 to 33; and of this 33, no less than 30 were Whigs.

#### NEW YORK.

The State of New York, under the rule of a Whig Governor and Legislature, presents a mortifying contrast to Democratic and patriotic Pennsylvania. It was a coalition between the Whigs and Abolitionists, which secured the election of the present Governor and Lieutenant-Governor, the latter of whom, if not the former, is an avowed Abolitionist. One of the first acts of the combined party, after they acquired a complete ascendancy over the State Government, was to turn out the State Printer, a thorough Democrat, who had always vindicated the constitutional rights of the South, and put in his place Thurlow Weed, a notorious and most active Abolitionist. The associations of this man and other active Whigs in Albany, are shown by a petition to the New York Legislature at the late session, which begin thus: "That under the original Constitution of the State, no disqualification was made of electors on account of color;" and ends as follows: "Your petitioners, therefore, respectfully request your honorable body to take the necessary preliminary measures (by the passage of a law) to enable the people of the State to abrogate the act of disfranchisement of the colored people contained in the end of the first section of the 2d article of the Constitution."

This paper was signed by Thurlow Weed, State Printer, Israel Smith, Loan Commissioner, appointed by Gov. Seward, Horace Greely, Editor of the "Log Cabin," a small paper sustained by the Whigs during the present season, B. Hoffman, one of the proprietors of the State paper, four negroes, and 80 to 100 other persons, nearly all Whigs. Of the very few Democrats who signed it, there was not one prominent man of the party.

But this is nothing compared with the action of the united Whig and Abolition parties in the Legislature.

Mr. Abijah Mann, late a distinguished Democratic member of Congress: offered in the House of Representatives of that State the following resolution, viz:

"Resolved, That this Legislature has seen with deep regret, and decidedly disapproves and condemns the efforts of many misguided individuals in the Northern States, to interfere, without right and in violation of the principles on which the Constitution of the United States was established, with the domestic institutions of our sister States at the South; thereby disturbing the domestic peace of the States, weakening the bonds of our Union, and sowing the seeds of its dissolution."

One of the Whig members having the floor, made a most violent speech against the resolution, denouncing the Administration of the General Government and the Democratic party; and to cut off all chance of a reply, concluded by demanding the previous question, in which he was sustained by his party. Under this gag, so unceremoniously applied, the resolution was voted down by 40 yeas to 57 nays, every year but one being a Democrat, and every nay a Whig.

But the Whig Abolition majority did not stop here; they proceeded to pass an act now standing as a law upon the statute book of New York, intended to prevent the recovery of, and practically emancipate, every Southern slave who may be able to reach that State!

The title of this act is, "An act to extend the right of trial by jury," of which we annex the most material portions, marked F.

The act was originally introduced into the House of Representatives. Mr. Roosevelt, a Democrat, moved to amend it so as to provide, that "so far as respects the penalty of Imprisonment in the State prison, it shall not be construed to extend to any claimant of a fugitive slave who shall have obtained the certificate of a judge or other officer, authorizing the removal of such slave, pursuant to the act of the Congress of the U. States in such case made and provided." This amendment was adopted by a vote of 47 to 37. Of the 47 yeas, 40 were Democrats and 7 Whigs. All the 37 nays were Whigs. The bill then passed by a vote of 59 to 24. Of the 59 yeas, 49 were Whigs and 10 Democrats, while the 24 nays were all Democrats.

The bill then went to the Senate. The provision exempting Southern men from the Penitentiary when they proceed according to the law of Congress in the recovery of their property, did not suit the spirit of



Abolition. In the Senate therefore, the united Whig and Abolition majority struck out this provision, and inserted the sixteenth and seventeenth sections, as they now stand in the act, the latter of which, in conjunction with the 8th section, imposes on any man, whether the owner of the slave or not, or whether he proceed according to the act of Congress or not, a penalty of \$500, and confinement in the Penitentiary for a term not exceeding ten years, for removing a fugitive from labor in any other manner than that prescribed in this State law. Thus amended, the bill passed the Senate by a vote of 15 to 4. Of the 15 yeas, 13 were Whigs and 2 were Democrats, while all the nays were Democrats.

When the bill was returned to the House, Mr. Birdseye, a Whig, moved to concur in the amendment of the Senate, and Mr. Roosevelt, a Democrat, moved to lay the motion on the table. Mr. Roosevelt's motion was negatived, and Mr. Birdseye's prevailed, by a vote of 41 to 31, all the yeas being Whigs, and all the nays being Democrats save one.

Thus, all the Whigs in the N. Y. Assembly save one voted to punish every Southern man who shall attempt to recover his slave property in that State, even though he may proceed in accordance with the laws of the U. States, with a fine of \$500, and ten years confinement in the penitentiary, while every Democrat voted against it. And this monstrous act, which attempts at a blow to annihilate one of the provisions of the Constitution, inserted for the protection of Southern property in slaves, received the signature of the Whig Governor of New York, and now stands upon the statute book of that State as a law!

No man can doubt that the object of the Abolitionists in procuring the passage of this act was to prevent altogether the recovery of fugitive slaves, who have made their way to that State. Holding that the master can have no legal property in his slave, and anticipating that some of their sect will be found on every jury, they believe that no verdict will ever be obtained by a master, and that every slave apprehended as a fugitive from labor will finally go free; and, to deter the master from resorting to other means for redress, not excepting those provided for by act of Congress, they hold up to him, in terror, heavy fines and imprisonment in the penitentiary!

Acting under the same fatal influence, the Whig Governor of New York has assumed a principle in relation to fugitives from justice never before heard of, we believe, and more fatal to the interests and safety of the South than even the Jury Act, which he approved.—Last year, three individuals from New York, being on board a vessel at Norfolk, Virginia, stole a slave from his master, and carried him to New York. The Governor of Virginia demanded of the Governor of New York to cause the thieves to be delivered up for trial, as provided by the Constitution and laws of the U. S.—This, the Governor of New York refused to do, on the assumption that, by the laws of New York, there can be no property in human beings; that by those laws the stealing of a slave is no crime; and that to justify the delivery of a fugitive from justice, the act with which he is charged must be a crime in the State to which he has fled! It is in vain that the Constitution of the U. States recognises a property in slaves; it is in vain that the U. S. in Congress have repeatedly recognized and taxed them as property; it is in vain that the Judiciary of the U. S. universally recognise this kind of property; the Governor of New York, though sworn to support the Constitution, when called upon to execute one of its provisions, declares that he cannot consider slaves as property! It is in vain, that the Constitution declares, in so many words, that "a person CHARGED IN ANY STATE with treason, felony or other crime, who shall flee from justice and be found in another State, shall, on demand of the Executive authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up to be removed to the State having jurisdiction of the crime," without conferring on the Executive authority of the State to which he fled power to go back a single step beyond the charge; yet, the Governor of New York has assumed the power to decide that the act charged is no crime, and under cover of that usurpation has refused to obey the mandate of the Constitution! So much of Gov. Seward's letter as shows the ground of his refusal is hereto annexed, marked G.

We cannot shut our eyes to the fact, that this extraordinary assumption by the Whig Governor of New York, which, so far as that State is concerned, annuls a provision of the Constitution designed for the benefit of the South, is the fruit of that union between Whigs and Abolitionists, from which he obtains his office and derives his power! Elected by Abolition votes, and relying upon them for re-election, new principles are sought after and new constructions adopted, fatal to the rights of the South, and the institutions of the country, to avoid offending the wild fanaticism which in that State holds the balance of power.

See, fellow-citizens, what, in the State of New York, has been the effect of the coalition between the Whigs and Abolitionists. To steal your negroes has become no crime! Citizens of New York may steal them from

your plantations or houses in the night, and carry them home in their ships; if you seek to punish the thieves, you are told it is no crime! If you seek to recover your stolen property, a New York jury, following the example of their Whig Governor, tell you there can be no property in a man! and if you seek redress in the Federal Courts, or otherwise, you are menaced with fines and the penitentiary! It is thus that the Whig Governor and Legislature of that State propose to keep your stolen property and to screen the thieves from punishment!

Now look at the Democracy of that State: Every man of them in the House of Assembly, and all but two in the Senate, voted against the infamous act.—Not only so, but at the close of the session they unanimously adopted, and incorporated in their "address to the Democratic Electors of the State of N. York," the following resolution, viz:

"Resolved, That the Federal majority, in passing a law at the present session, inflicting a penalty of five hundred dollars on any person who attempts to recover a fugitive slave—a measure designed to catch Abolition votes—and at the same time giving their support to General Harrison, who voted in the Ohio Legislature to sell poor white men for slaves—furnish an apt illustration of their principles and their consistency, and if the bill had passed as it was originally prepared by the Judiciary Committee, and in which form it was urged upon the House, the Federal candidate for Vice President might have been sent to the State prison for ten years, provided one of his slaves had taken refuge in this State, and he had attempted to recover him, in the manner prescribed by a law of Congress."

## OHIO.

From this theatre of outrage and bad faith under Whig authority, it is pleasant to turn to the conduct of the State of Ohio under Democratic rule. Passing over the strong resolutions adopted by the Legislature of that State in 1839, we come directly to a more decisive act, exhibiting the determination of her Democracy to maintain the compromises of the Constitution and preserve peace and good feeling with the slaveholding States.

Suffering from the acts of the Abolitionists enticing away the slaves from the counties bordering on the Ohio river, concealing and sending them to Canada, the Legislature of Kentucky resolved to send Commissioners to Ohio to ask for the passage of more effective laws by the latter State, to put an end to the evil. In their communication to the Governor and Legislature of Ohio, dated January 26th, 1839, the Kentucky Commissioners thus set forth the grievances of which their State complained, viz:

"In calling the attention of the Legislature of Ohio to the subject of the foregoing resolution, and soliciting for it their respectful and deliberate consideration, the undersigned would remark, that the injuries sustained by the citizens of Kentucky, inhabiting the counties bordering on the Ohio river, adjacent to this State, by the loss of their slaves, has ceased to be confined to a small number of persons. Facts within the personal knowledge of the representatives of those counties, and communicated to the Legislature in numerous memorials of the people, leave no doubt that losses are felt to an alarming extent, threatening, in the absence of more efficient legislation, not only to lessen the value, but to endanger materially the tenure of that species of property in many of the counties of the Commonwealth, and to excite disaffection and disturbance among citizens of the common confederacy who should feel themselves allied by the strongest ties of fraternity and friendship.

"Late developments, moreover, of a character so conspicuous as to require from the undersigned no more than a bare allusion to them, have attracted the attention of the good citizens, both of Ohio and Kentucky, to the existence of an organized plan of operation, by means of which, after the slaves of the citizens of Kentucky are enticed from their owners, they are first concealed and afterwards conveyed through the State of Ohio to the British Northwestern dominions, with such secrecy and despatch as to elude at once, detection and pursuit."

Responsive to the call of a sister State, the Ohio Legislature immediately took up the subject, and a bill was reported "relating to fugitives from labor or service from other States."

During the progress of this bill in the House of Representatives, Mr. Lloyd, a Whig, moved an amendment to the effect, that the individual claimed as a slave, shall have the right of trial by jury, &c., which was rejected. The bill passed the House by a vote of 52 to 15. Of the 52 yeas, 40 were Democrats and 12 Whigs. Of the nays, every man was a Whig.

After resolute opposition by some of the Whig members, the bill passed the Senate by a vote of 26 to 10.—Of the yeas, 19 were Democrats and 7 Whigs; of the nays, all were Whigs.

The act was approved by Mr. Shannon, the Democratic Governor of the State, and thus became a law. We annex the principal sections of the act, marked H.

In this just and noble manner did the Democratic State of Ohio evince her regard for her Federal obligations, and the interests of her sister States. It is in the prevalence of such a spirit that we are to look for the perpetuity of the Union, the inviolability of State rights, and the preservation of individual liberty.

## RESULTS.

You cannot fail to have perceived the striking fact, that wherever in the North the Whigs have the ascendancy, there Abolition is strongest; but wherever the Democrats govern, there the rights of the South, and the compromises of the Constitution, are sacredly regarded. You will have perceived, that in the various State Legislatures, the Whigs as a party have countenanced, aided and abetted the Abolitionists, while the Democratic party have opposed them.

While most of the States where the Whig party bear sway, have adopted Abolition resolutions, no Democratic State, as far as we are informed or believe, has adopted or countenanced such proceedings. And while the Democratic State of Ohio, by the action of both her Legislature and Executive Departments, has taken the most effective steps to protect the rights and property of her sister States, the State of New York, while under Whig rule, has resorted to measures of wrong and outrage towards the South of the most aggravated description.

## FURTHER PROOF.

Is any other proof wanting to show the close union between the Whig and the Abolitionists of the North? We have it in their combined action in reference to the next Presidential election.

It is known to you that the Whigs and Democrats have each held their National Conventions within the last few months, in reference to the next election of President of the U. S. The Democratic Convention held at Baltimore in May last, in which there were delegates from the non-slaveholding States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan, (as well as from most of the Southern States,) regarding this as one of the most important questions of the day, did not pass it by in silence. The committee appointed "to prepare resolutions, declaratory of the principles of the Republican party of the Union," consisting of one member from each of the States represented in the Convention, and the Chairman of which committee was the Hon. R. H. Gillet of New York, reported the following, amongst other resolutions, viz:

"Resolved, That Congress has no power, under the Constitution, to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the Southern States, and that such States are the sole and proper judges of every thing appertaining to their own affairs, not prohibited by the Constitution; that all efforts of the Abolitionists or others made to induce Congress to interfere with questions of slavery, or to take incipient steps in relation thereto, are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences, and that all such efforts have an inevitable tendency to diminish the happiness of the people, and endanger the stability and permanency of the Union, and ought not to be countenanced by any friend to our political institutions."

The question was taken on this resolution, as on all the others, separately, and it was adopted unanimously—every Democrat from the non-slaveholding as well as the slaveholding States voting for it. Can any Southern man ask a stronger assurance, that the great majority of the Democratic party of the North are ready and anxious to continue to us the protection of the constitutional guarantee?

Now let us enquire, where is the resolution of corresponding character, to be found in the proceedings either of the National Whig Convention held at Harrisburg or Baltimore? We answer emphatically, *no where*. Neither of those conventions adopted any resolution upon the subject; and why did they not? Can any one of you resist the conclusion, that it was to avoid giving offence to, or losing the support of, the Abolition branch of their party?

Every movement of the combined party since has tended to confirm this conclusion.

Every Abolitionist and every Northern Whig in Congress, supports the nomination of Gen. Harrison. Of the Executive Committee appointed by the concurrent action of the Whigs and Abolitionists in that body to promote his election, there are three pledged Abolitionists, and three Northern Whigs associated, we are sorry to say, with three Southern Whigs. The nomination of Harrison itself is well known to have been carried by a coalition between the Whigs and Abolitionists. Many of the delegates to the Harrisburg Convention had already been in their several States the leaders of Abolition movements. Such were James F. Simmons, the chairman of the committee in the Rhode Island Legislature, which reported the Abolition resolutions, Wm. Clarke, Geo. Chambers, Wm. Darlington, Jno. Dickey, E. T. McDowell, James Merrill, and E. C. Riegart, who took an active part in favor of the Abolition movements in the convention to amend the Constitution of Pennsylvania.

## ABOLITION TRIUMPH.

Indeed, the results of the Harrisburg Convention were every where hailed by the Abolitionists as a signal triumph. Henry Clay, Abolition aside, was known to be the first choice of the Convention; but he had rendered himself obnoxious to the Abolitionists by his denunciations of their mad projects in the Senate of the U. S., in addition to which he was a slaveholder. For those reasons, the Abolitionists in the Convention set themselves at work to defeat his nomination, and succeeded; whereupon, a shout of triumph arose from the whole of the fanatical sect.



The Liberator, their organ in Boston, said, "we regard this as another important sign of the times, as a signal defeat of the Slaveocracy power in that Convention. Had it not been for Abolitionism, H. Clay would undoubtedly have been nominated. We have faith to believe that no slaveholder will ever again be permitted to fill the Presidential office in this Republic."

The Emancipator, their organ in New York, said: "Praise to God for a great anti-slavery victory. A man of high talents, of great distinction, of long political services, of boundless personal popularity, has been openly rejected for the Presidency of this Republic, on account of his devotion to slavery. Set up a monument of progress there, 'a slaveholder is incapacitated for the Presidency of the United States,' &c."

The Philanthropist, their organ at Cincinnati, declared that the Abolition Editors all regarded the "rejection of Mr. Clay, and the selection of General Harrison, as to some extent a concession to the spirit of liberty in the North."

The Oberlin (Ohio) Evangelist said: "the nomination of William Henry Harrison for President of the United States, and the rejection of Henry Clay, shows that a slaveholder can never again expect to be President of this free Republic." It may now be regarded as a settled matter, that Henry Clay, nor any other slaveholder, can ever be President of the United States, even supposing the party to which he belongs to be the majority. "For what has been gained we will render thanks to God, and for what is yet needed to be gained, we will trust in the same God, and in the faithful and diligent use of the same means which have prevented the nomination of a slaveholder for President this time."

On a subsequent day, the Liberator said: "It is needless to multiply proofs that the defeat of Henry Clay at Harrisburg, was deemed by Abolitionists generally a clear demonstration of the growth of anti-slavery in the free States."

Not only the Abolition presses, but Abolition societies and conventions, joined in the chorus of triumph at the exclusion of a slaveholder from nomination, solely because he was a slaveholder.

The Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, at their annual meeting,

*Resolved*, That we regard the refusal of the Harrisburg Convention to nominate Henry Clay as a candidate for the Presidency, as a signal and glorious triumph of truth over error, of liberty over slavery, &c., &c.

The Executive Committee of the National Anti-Slavery Society, at the late meeting of the society in New York, used in their report the following language, viz: "We declare our entire conviction, that the cause itself for which the society was formed, and to which, it is therefore merely secondary, is advancing in the public mind with great rapidity and power. The rejection of Henry Clay, a slaveholder and defender of slavery, is a way-mark in our history." This is the very first evidence they adduce of the advancement of their cause, to which they add, among others, "the peaceful delivery of that portion of the Hon. William Slade's Speech which presses the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, with its insertion in the columns of the National Intelligencer, which," they say, "shows the beginning of a change in the feelings of slaveholders." Nor do the committee omit to notice, as another evidence of the advance of their cause, the act of the New York Legislature to which we have referred. They say, "Mr. Birney had the opportunity of speaking at length on the subject in the Representatives' hall of the State of New York, before a committee, and in the presence of a large number of the members of the State Legislature, now in session, which removed some of the misapprehensions as to the jury bill and some other measures in agitation."

The Harrisburg nomination is nothing more nor less than one of the boasted fruits of the coalition between the Northern Whigs and Abolitionists, which has produced their joint action in the State Legislatures in passing resolutions and acts destructive to the rights and interests of the South, and dangerous to the peace and union of these States. If this coalition shall succeed in obtaining control of the Governments of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, and if all those States shall pass laws similar to that passed by New York, and their Executive authorities shall adopt the same course of action, what security will the slaveholding States have for their property? Every slave who can succeed in passing the limits of those States, will be practically free. Thieves will steal your slaves and be protected with their plunder throughout all those States bordering on the slaveholding region. The Constitution of the U. S. and the laws of Congress for the protection of your slave property will not only be made void, but it will be a crime to execute them. The lands of the South, after the withdrawal of the hands that cultivate them, will lose more than half their value, and abject poverty, if not absolute desolation, will be the fate of vast regions of a now productive and growing country.

#### WHO ARE OUR FRIENDS?

What party is it which is battling the cause of the South in Ohio and Pennsylvania? It is the Democratic

party. Should they be overpowered by the coalition of Whigs and Abolitionists, what will be the consequences? The just and liberal act of Ohio will be repealed, and the plunder law of New York will be substituted in its place, while its Governors will protect the plunderers. The Stevenses, the Sergeants, the Dennys, and their Abolition associates in the Convention of Pennsylvania, who were baffled by the Democracy, will use the power of the Legislature and Governor to accomplish the object heretofore unsuccessfully attempted. All barriers which protect our interests, the comity of neighbors, the obligations of compacts, every principle, every law, and every institution which obstructs this fell spirit, will be swept away, and we shall be compelled to struggle, unaided, for the preservation of our constitutional rights, if not for our existence as States.

Under these circumstances, can any man shut his eyes to the fact, that the mass of the party which support General Harrison in the non-slaveholding States, is practically the enemy of the South, whatever may be the feelings of many of the individuals which compose it? Is any one so blind as not to perceive that the consequences which have immediately followed their entire ascendancy in the State of New York, will inevitably follow their ascendancy in every other of the non-slaveholding States? Does not every one know, that the same strength which will give Harrison the vote of those States, will also throw their Executive and legislative authorities into the hands of the Abolitionists and their allies? Are not the triumphs of Harrison and of anti-slavery in those States to be achieved by the same men, by the same presses, by the same arguments? And is not the cause of the one, to all practical intents, the cause of the other? No intelligent man, after surveying the field of political action, can doubt it. On the other hand, is not the cause of Democracy in those States the cause of anti-Abolition, the cause of the South, of justice, and the Constitution; and will not its signal triumph secure the slaveholding States in all their peculiar rights and interests?

To us it seems amazing, that, under these circumstances, the South does not, as one man, declare in favor of the Northern Democracy. Mr. Jefferson said, that the "Democracy of the North is the natural ally of the South;" and never was the truth of the declaration, or the importance of the alliance, more manifest than at this moment.

We beg every Southern man, to whatever party he may belong, to answer to his own bosom the following questions:

Do you approve the resolutions on the subject of Abolition adopted by the Whigs of the Northern Legislatures, and particularly the act passed by that party in the Legislature of New York, and the refusal of the Governor to surrender negro-stealers upon the demand of the Executive of Virginia?

Do you desire to see the same kind of legislation and Executive action resorted to by the Legislatures and Governors of Pennsylvania and Ohio, and other non-slaveholding States?

Do you not believe it to be your duty to oppose, with all your power and influence, a party, the triumph of which will inevitably lead to such fatal results?

Do you not approve the anti-Abolition resolutions adopted by the Democratic Legislatures of the North, and especially the act of Ohio relative to fugitive slaves?

Do you desire to see the same spirit maintained, and the same legislation prevail, throughout the non-slaveholding States?

Do you not believe it to be your duty to encourage, cherish, and aid a party which evinces, not by words only, but by acts, its devotion to your interests and safety, and its fidelity to the Constitution?

#### THE CONSEQUENCES.

Two things are certain: If the South repel and treat with scorn her friends and allies in the North, she will soon have none? And if she league herself with her enemies, she must be destroyed! Is it politic to make enemies of our fellow-citizens in Pennsylvania and Ohio, in Indiana and Illinois, when it is just as easy to have friends? Would it be convenient to line the borders of Maryland and Virginia, of Kentucky and Missouri, with our sons in arms to repel aggression, or save our property from the hands of Abolitionists and negro-stealers, in or out of authority? These things we should think of only in the last extremity—only after resorting to all peaceful, just, and prudent means to maintain our rights, and preserve the peace and union of the States. And is not concert of action with those in the free States, who acknowledge and stand ready to defend and maintain those rights, our first peaceful remedy, our first and most obvious duty? If we refuse to act with them, can we expect them to act with us? If we sacrifice them to their enemies, and ours, how can we hereafter expect their aid, or even sympathy? It would be as unreasonable to expect it, as it would be impossible to obtain it. Upon your heads would fall the guilt, not only of surrendering our dearest interests to our natural enemy, but also the crime of ingratitude in abandoning our "natural allies."

#### THE CANDIDATES.

Is there any thing really objectionable in the candi-

date whom the Northern Democracy presents for our support, or any thing peculiarly attractive for a Southern man in the candidate of the Whig Abolitionists? Mr. Van Buren enjoys a fair moral character, talents of a high order, principles on every leading measure of public policy in conformity with those of the South, and is, moreover, pledged, by all legal means, even to the use of the veto, if necessary, to resist the measures of the Abolitionists. The attacks made upon him are, in every instance yet disclosed, founded in utter falsehood, or upon circumstances misunderstood, or too frivolous to be brought, for a moment, in comparison with the great interests now involved in the struggle of parties. On the other hand, the candidate presented by the Whig Abolition party of the North, stands identified with all the great measures and principles which the South has opposed and resisted almost "unto blood." True it is, that at different periods he has given out indications of being on different sides of most of these great questions; and it is equally true, that he refuses to state on which side he now stands. If not an Abolitionist, he has, while refusing publicly to answer any question on the subject, written letters, and one to the Hon. George Evans, member of Congress from the State of Maine, giving an Abolition coloring to his acts and opinions, with the view of obtaining the support of those implacable enemies of the South. True it is, that, at about the same period, he was writing letters to the South, denying his Abolitionism, with the view of obtaining also the support of slaveholders! It appears that most, if not all, of these letters, were written under an injunction that they should not be published. He has expressed no opinions on the subject upon which the South can rely, and stands ready to act with the one party or the other, as either may have a majority in Congress. Indeed, from evidence, the truth of which we do not doubt, it appears he has recently declared, on more than one occasion, that he will not veto any bill which Congress may pass!

The nomination of Mr. Seward for Governor of New York, and the nomination of Gen. Harrison for President of the United States, were both procured by the same means—by a coalition of Whigs and Abolitionists. In New York they succeeded in making the Governor; and what has been the result? Concessions to the Abolitionists, which on one subject, annihilate the Constitution and laws in that State, deprive the property of the South of the stipulated protection, and give encouragement and shelter to those who steal it. This is the natural fruit of such a coalition. Elected by Abolition votes, the Governor is able to retain his office only by the assistance of those auxiliaries, and the Constitution and the rights of the South are sacrificed to secure it. If Gen. Harrison, after being nominated by a similar coalition, shall reach the Presidential chair, must not the same results necessarily follow? Will it not be equally necessary to secure the continued support of the Abolitionists, and will not similar means be resorted to? Will not the party in power be compelled to concede to their allies the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, the interdiction of the transportation of slaves from State to State, the withdrawal in every possible way of the protection guaranteed by the Constitution to slave property, and encouragement to those who steal it? A voice from Heaven could not more certainly warn the South of the consequences of placing the power of the Union in the hands of such a coalition, than the example in New York! Why have the three Abolition members of the Whig Executive Committee, and their numerous associates in Congress, postponed any attempt to redeem the written pledges given to their constituents, that they would use every effort to procure the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and an interdiction of the slave trade between the several States and Territories? Why did they not redeem those pledges at the late session? Is it supposed that they have relinquished all intention to redeem them, or that their Abolition constituents will permit them to do so? No; it is only postponed, lest the South should take the alarm too soon. It is postponed until they make a President by their votes—until their aid becomes essential to sustain a party in power. Then, as in New York, they expect to see the Constitution and the rights of the South sacrificed to maintain a party ascendancy, and secure the offices of the General Government. This result is as certain as that cause produces effect. We have already seen indications of the sacrifice. The Southern Whigs in Congress have already united with Abolitionists in appointing a political committee; Southern Whigs have consented to act with pledged Abolitionists upon that committee; Southern Whigs, at the late session of Congress, were found voting with Abolitionists against propositions relative to Abolition petitions, which formerly they had unanimously supported; fearful of offending the Abolition spirit, a Whig committee of the House of Representatives refused to report a bill to prohibit the introduction of negro testimony in courts martial held in the slaveholding States or Territories; for the first time, we believe, a formal Abolition speech from Mr. Slade was listened to on the floor of the House; and for the first time, such a speech was



disseminated far and wide through the columns of the most respectable Whig newspaper in Washington.—The coalition at Harrisburg has already produced union of political action between the Whigs and Abolitionists in Congress; it is but one step more to a union of legislative action, and that step will assuredly be taken as soon as a President shall have been elected with the aid of Abolition votes. Not to believe this, is to close our minds to the approaches of reason, and shut our eyes to the warnings of example.

And CAN the South give up the security she has in the character, pledges, and conduct of Mr. Van Buren, and in the principles, declarations, and acts of the party which supports him, for the chances of justice she may have from a man without any publicly avowed principles, elevated to the Presidency by a coalition of which the sacrifice of her rights and principles is every where the necessary fruit? We cannot believe it. Such infatuation does not exist among the people of the South.

What! submit to, register and approve the fiat of Abolition, that "to be a slaveholder is to disqualify a man for President?" Is there an honest man in the South who will not resist this unconstitutional proscription? Is there one among us who, by bowing his neck and giving his support to the Harrisburg nomination, will degrade his State, degrade the statesmen whom he delights to honor, degrade himself, and make the Southern States and Southern statesmen, not the equals, as the Constitution makes them, but the provinces, inferiors and vassals of the Northern States and Northern men? Who is there among us, that with the hope of receiving minor offices at the hands of Abolition Presidents, will manly sacrifice the dignity and honor, as well as the rights, interests, and safety, of his State and its people? We hope not one.

#### OUR TRUE POLICY.

The true course for the South is, to reject and repudiate all connection, direct or indirect, with Abolition and its allies. It is, to vote for no man for any office in the Government, who will not openly renounce and denounce all connexion with Abolition, direct or indirect, and pledge himself to exert all the powers vested in him by the Constitution and laws, to protect the constitutional rights of the slaveholding States. It is to support such statesmen as are true to the Constitution and faithful to their duties as members of this great confederacy. This course of conduct, steadily and sternly pursued, would afford to the South an immediate and ample protection. True to themselves, presenting an unbroken front, and never wavering from their purpose, it is to be hoped the South would find in other sections, men in sufficient numbers, influenced by a sense of obligation to the Constitution, to make up a majority of the Union, secure to Southern men their constitutional equality, to Southern interests their constitutional protection, and to the whole Union, that limited, benign, and just Government, which the fathers of the Republic intended to establish.

It is in the hope of promoting this grand and salutary union of sentiment in the South, no less useful to the Union and encouraging to mankind, than it is essential to your own interests and safety, that we have taken the trouble to collect these facts and submit these views.

C. C. CLAY, of Ala.  
R. C. NICHOLAS, of La.  
WM. S. FULTON, of Ark.  
FRANCIS THOMAS, of Md.  
GEO. C. DROMGOOLE, of Va.  
J. J. McKAY, of N. C.  
FELIX GRUNDY, of Tenn.  
WILSON LUMPKIN, of Ga.  
JOHN JAMESON, of Mo.  
LINN BOYD, of Ky.  
A. G. BROWN, of Miss.  
T. D. SUMPTER, of S. C.

#### EXTRACTS FROM W. F. WATSON'S SPEECH, Delivered before the Democratic Association of this City. The Veto Power.

In his letter to S. Williams in 1836, he says:

"I consider the qualified veto upon the acts of the Legislature, conferred by the Constitution upon the President, as a *Conservative power*, intended only to be used to secure the instrument itself from violation, or, in times of high party excitement, to protect the rights of the minority, and the interests of the weaker members of the Union."

In his letter to Harmer Denny in 1838, he says:

"That in the exercise of the veto power, he should limit his rejection of bills to, first: Such as are, in his opinion, unconstitutional; second: Such as tend to encroach on the rights of the States or individuals; third: Such as involving deep interests, may, in his opinion, require more mature deliberation or reference to the will of the people, to be ascertained at the succeeding elections."

In his speech made at Cleveland the other day, it has been stated that he went so far as to say that he would sign any bill passed by Congress. Now, Sir, I am free to admit that I did not give credence to this report. I thought it stamped with improbability; but in consequence of this rumor, we more recently find reported in a Whig paper what he did say in that speech. Here it is:

"He considered it of the first importance that the Administration of the Government should be brought back to its original purity, and that the Executive power and influence should be continued within the limits prescribed by the spirit of the Constitution—that the will of the People, expressed through their Repre-

sentatives, and not the will of one man, should govern in all questions touching the general welfare—that the President should not and that he would not, if elected, interpose the veto power between the wishes of the People and the legitimate objects of their desires, except to preserve the sacred charter of our liberties from manifest violation."

In the doctrine he announces in 1836 and '38, he clearly admits the exercise of the veto power to be as great an extent as has ever been claimed for it, and within which every exercise of the power that has taken place could be justified. But in 1840, in his Cleveland speech, there is certainly a great relaxation of the exercise of this power. "The will of the people expressed through their representatives, and not the will of one man, should govern in all questions touching the general welfare." These dangerous words, "general welfare," appear to be specially brought in—words, within which the Constitution can be made to embrace all things ever contemplated by the most latitudinous constructionist. Are they not the very words so much relied on by the Federalists, to wring from that instrument powers, that the Republican party have ever denied and repudiated; yet Mr. H. tells the people, that if their representatives pass any act which they may consider necessary for the "general welfare," that the President should not, and he would not, if elected, "interpose the veto power between the wishes of the people and the legitimate objects of their desires." So if he did not say that he would sign any bill passed by Congress, he certainly, by the authority I quote, approximates somewhat to it. To be sure he says, "except to preserve the sacred charter of our liberties from manifest violation." Here, Sir, is certainly an admission that he would exercise the power, when he thought there was a "manifest violation." He places the exercise as far off as it is possible, acknowledging the right at all; and when we have to determine what shall be considered a "manifest violation," for one, I must declare, that I am in a labyrinth in satisfactorily determining when it would be, that Mr. Harrison would exercise the veto power.—A "manifest violation," is, I suppose, one acknowledged to be so, by the country generally; and, Sir, it might be said, that a power has never yet been claimed by the General Government which would be considered a "manifest violation" of the Constitution, in this sense. It certainly might be so said by Mr. H. Indeed, Sir, he has in all conscience, given himself ample latitude. The highest-toned Federalist that ever lived, could not hold opinions on this subject that could, in practice, wring more from the Constitution. In 1822, you will remember, Mr. H. said, "I believe that the charter given to the bank was unconstitutional; it being not one of those measures necessary to carry any of the expressly granted powers into effect." In 1836 he said, "if it were clearly ascertained that the public interest in relation to the collection and disbursement of the revenue, would materially suffer without one, and there were unequivocal manifestations of public opinion in its favor." You will observe, Sir, that in 1822, he denied the constitutionality of a bank, not upon the ground that it was not a delegated power, but upon the ground "that it was not a power conferred even to carry a delegated power into effect."—Yet, in 1836, he would sign a bill thus admitted by himself, in the fullest manner, to be unconstitutional! In 1836 and 1838, he said he would veto an unconstitutional bill. He admits a bank to be unconstitutional; yet, in 1836, he would sign such a bill. Who can reconcile such a state of facts? Is he not thus arrayed against himself, as he is on every subject with which he stands connected? However, by his doctrine on the veto power, in 1840, he gets over all difficulty; for he can say, it is not a "MANIFEST VIOLATION," therefore, it is constitutional, and therefore, I would sign a bill. It is, Sir, I believe, contended for by the Federal party, that the Federal judiciary, are in all cases the expounders of the Constitution, and that its decisions are to be obligatory, and moreover, that when a President takes an oath to support the Constitution, he is not to support it as he interprets it, but as it has been interpreted by the judiciary. This is Federal doctrine—the doctrine which is to make the Federal Government omnipotent—the States, mere creatures at the footstool of concentrated power. In 1822, Mr. H. did not hold this doctrine; for, in his address to the people of Ohio, when a candidate for Congress, he says: "And where is the crime in one set of men not being able to interpret the Constitution, as other men interpret it?—As we had all sworn to support it, the crime would have been in giving it a construction which our consciences would not sanction." It is clear, judging from this, that he then considered the Constitution ought to be supported in accordance with the opinions of those taking the oath, to do so; and if that is his opinion, how could he say in 1836, he would sign a bill which he had said was unconstitutional in 1822? How could he, in 1836, sign a bill which in 1836 and '38 he said he would veto, in his declaration, that he would veto unconstitutional bills? Why, Sir, even as late as 1838, in his letter to H. Denny he says, "such as are in his opinion unconstitutional."—Would he not, therefore, be doing that which his own conscience "would not sanction?" But while his opinions in 1836 and '38 place him in this attitude, he opens a new door in 1840 at Cleveland, on the veto

power, through which any measure may find admittance. But, Sir, his recognition in his Cheviot speech in 1833, of the doctrines of the Proclamation, taken in connexion with "the speeches of Mr. Webster in the Senate of the United States, in answer to the arguments of Mr. Calhoun," place him upon undoubted ground. Standing in this Federal position, the decisions of the U. S. Court must be his decisions. But if additional proof is required, what do we find him saying in that same speech?—"By a course as quiet, as peaceable as the operation of those laws which the Creator has assigned for the government of the material world, the judiciary department restrains the other branches of the General Government from the exercise of unconstitutional powers, and the States from those aberrations to which a tendency has so often been manifested." The power and authority of the judiciary was never more fully and unequivocally surrendered, as understood by the Federalists; and take this admission, with his "MANIFEST VIOLATION" of the Constitution, and perhaps we may be enabled to arrive at some definite conclusion as to the manner in which Mr. H. would exercise the veto power.

#### What is his position in regard to the

#### Dangers of a Public Debt?

When in the Senate of Ohio, on the 14th December, 1819, the following resolution was reported by a Committee, adopted and voted for by Mr. Harrison:

"Resolved, That in the present state of pecuniary embarrassment amongst the people, it is unwise and impolitic for the Government to pay off the public debt more rapidly than the obligations it may have come under to its creditors may require; and that any surplus in the Treasury would be more usefully employed in the internal improvement of the country by roads and canals, and in the support and encouragement of domestic manufactures; which motion to agree was decided in the affirmative—Yeas 24, nays 2."

The Senate then came to the following resolution, on motion of Mr. Harrison:

"Resolved, That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives requested to use their exertions to procure the passage of laws, embracing the principles recommended in the foregoing resolutions."

At this time, or on the 1st October of that year, the National Debt amounted to \$91,728,527 51. In Mr. H.'s letter to the Inquisitor, in 1822, he holds the following language:

"I believe in the tendency of a large public debt to sap the foundation of the Constitution, by creating a moneyed aristocracy, whose views and interests must be in direct hostility to those of the mass of the people."

Yet, Sir, holding opinions such as those, he is willing to sustain measures, by his own votes, "the tendency of which is to sap the foundation of the Constitution." What a sagacious statesman! But while my object has been to shew the difference between his professions and his practice, it will not pass unobserved, that he wished the payment of the Public Debt retarded, that Congress might take the funds to foster Internal Improvements—and in supporting Domestic Manufactures. Yet all this will, I suppose, be termed Republicanism and consummate wisdom by our opponents. But, Sir, we leave this subject to pass to one of infinitely more importance, and I wish that even here I could hold up Mr. H. in terms that would be gratifying.

What are we next presented with, Mr. President, on the humbug catalogue? THE HOOR CASE, by which it is made to appear that Mr. Van Buren is in favor of the admission of negro testimony against white persons.—Well, Sir, what are the facts? Lieut. Hoor was tried in March last by a court martial of his brother officers on board the Macedonias, in the Bay of Pensacola. In the progress of his trial, two colored seamen, or persons attached to the vessel, were introduced as testimony; to which Lieut. Hoor objected. His objection was overruled, (it having been the custom to admit such evidence.) And mark, Mr. President, this court martial was composed of seven members—all Whigs—and five of them from the South. The court found Lieut. Hoor guilty. On the 2d charge, where this objectionable testimony was introduced, Lieut. Hoor was acquitted; and on the 4th specification of the 1st and 3d charges, where this evidence was likewise introduced, he was found guilty; but upon evidence ample in itself, without a resort to that of the colored persons.—So, in point of fact, their testimony did not convict him. He, however, took his case before the President of the United States. The opinions of the law officers were obtained; they inform him, that it is the common law, which is our law in such cases; "that where, upon the whole case, justice has been done, and the verdict is substantially right, no new trial will be granted, although there may have been some mistakes committed." Upon an examination of the case, and the opinions, and in obedience to the law of the land, the President refuses to interfere with the decision of the Court below. Now, Sir, it is here evident to every man, that the colored testimony had nothing to do with the conviction—yet, has not this case been so garbled and misrepresented that every effort has been made to establish the belief, that Lieutenant Hoor was found guilty upon colored testimony, and that the President approved the proceedings, while, the fact is, no such case was presented to him. The first action, Mr.



President, had in Congress, on this subject, was through Mr. Botts, the member of Congress from this district, and one of the joint committee I have referred to. It is curious to examine the course of this gentleman upon this Hooe case. He succeeded very effectually in bringing it before the country, and I believe he avowed his object was attained when he did so. However, be that as it may, on the 13th July, Mr. Chapman of Alabama moved the following resolution:

*"Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary to which was referred the case of Lieut. Hooe, be required to report forthwith to this House who are legal witnesses under the existing laws before the Courts in the Navy of the U. S., and further to report who shall hereafter be examined as witnesses in trials before such Courts."*

The motion was to suspend the rules to take this Resolution up. Who voted AGAINST the suspension?—JOHN M. BOTTS.

On the day after the 14th, Mr. Chapman offered the following resolution:

*"Resolved, That the judiciary committee having charge of the case of Lieut. Hooe, do forthwith report a bill to this House, prohibiting the enlistment of negroes or colored persons in the service of the navy or army of the United States."*

The motion was to suspend the rules, to take this resolution up. Who voted AGAINST the suspension?—J. M. BOTTS.

This is the course of this gentleman—the first to move in the Hooe case. And, in connection with these votes, it might relevantly be asked, is not this the same Mr. Botts who is on the joint committee with such worthy peers as Truman Smith, Leverett Saltonstall and J. C. Clark, NOTORIOUS ABOLITIONISTS?—THE VERY SAME JOHN M. BOTTS.

Well, sir, what next have we? THE SPEECH OF THE "FOUL-MOUTHED" Ogle, (as he was so called by Mr. Jamieson of Missouri,) upon the furniture in the President's house. He, sir, has been from the kitchen to the garret, and the result of his travel has been a production so base in itself, as absolutely to bring out Mr. Lincoln of Massachusetts, a Whig, denying the truth of its contents. Mr. Van Buren charged with extravagance! Why, sir, listen to Mr. Lincoln, the authority of a political enemy, who had the magnanimity to come out and meet this man:

"What I did say was, in substance, that since I had been at the head of the Committee, for a period of nearly three years, no appropriation, to my knowledge, had been made at the request of the President; that the committee had always acted on the requisition and estimates of the Commissioner of Public Buildings, and that on one occasion, when the President had been referred to, as to the need of a proposed appropriation, he had declined expressing any opinion or wish upon the subject."

Mr. President, will not our opponents be satisfied, when they read this language from one of their own party? Will they not be satisfied when they see that appropriations have always been made for furnishing the national mansion to receive the nation's guests—for the People themselves to repair to see their President? Sir, listen to this:

"By a law of the 2d of March, 1797, just previous to the commencement of the administration of the elder Adams, Congress made the following appropriation:

"Proceeds of sale of old furniture, and so much in addition thereto as the President may judge necessary, not exceeding \$14,000.

"During the administration of Mr. Jefferson, the appropriations amounted to \$29,000.

"In that of Mr. Madison to \$28,000.

"It was in this period that the house was sacked by the British upon their incursion into Washington during the war, and the furniture which, from the beginning, had cost the nation upwards of \$70,000, was wholly destroyed.

"After the repair of the house, in the years 1817 and 1818, during the administration of Mr. Monroe, the records show appropriations for refurbishing it to the aggregate amount of \$50,000.

"In the administration of Mr. John Q. Adams, the grants amounted to \$23,000.

"In that of Gen. Jackson to \$29,000; and

"In that of Mr. V. Buren, they have been, to this time \$30,000.

Is Mr. Van Buren here in a more obnoxious position than any or all of his predecessors, according to this exhibit of facts, which I take from Mr. Lincoln's able speech? Let them be read. The people can then, and will explode the humbug. How does Mr. Lincoln conclude his withering remarks when lashing Ogle for attempting to place the Presidents of this country and their representatives in the position of thieves, and by charging the latter with "plundering the Treasury and robbing their constituents?"

"If such appropriations deserve the character now attempted to be given them, how happens it that in forty years there has been no resistance to their passage? How happens it, indeed, that, in the last Congress, of which this Pennsylvanian, of more than Spartan virtue, was a member, no opposition was offered to grants precisely similar to those contained in the present bill? They passed without objection then.

"Mr. Ogle. No; a member near me says he objected.

"Mr. Lincoln. Who is the man? I heard of no dissent. If any had the virtue, at that time, to think it wrong, he had not the courage to make it known. Where is the recorded vote at a call even for a division upon the question?"

Sir, we have heard much about golden plateaux, gold vases, knives, forks and spoons; but, the fact is, they are not gold, but gilt, and the fact, moreover, is, that most of them were procured during Mr. Monroe's administration. So much, Sir, for this humbug. One more, Mr. President, and I will be done:

THE CENSUS.—In connection with the taking of

which, in accordance with the law of the land, there has been set on foot a prepared table of interrogatories, which the Census-takers are to use for the purpose of getting statistical information of the resources of our country—information, as we all know, of a most valuable character, and in which we are greatly deficient. The scheme of getting this information, in the mode mentioned, was, I believe, suggested by the Editor of that valuable publication, the "Boston Almanac," and by Professor Leiber of South Carolina. It happens, too, that the Whigs in Congress were the active parties in carrying out the suggestions. Every man must concede the value of such knowledge, and that no more efficient or cheaper means could be resorted to, to obtain it. The law directing its being done, annexes no penalty to the refusal to answer the interrogatories propounded. It was of course to be presumed, that every good citizen would feel an interest in contributing most willingly, his aid in facilitating the design. But, sir, what do we see? Our opponents engaged in alarming the people—telling them the information sought is the precursor of a direct tax, and advising them to withhold it. One of our citizens, an active Whig politician, in a neighboring county, and an intelligent man, absolutely comes out, seriously, over his own name, to toll the alarm, and to caution the people. And why all this, Mr. President? Why all these humbugs and false issues? Can the Whigs expect to succeed by such means? Is there no shame abiding among them? Sir, if shame has any blush, their cheeks ought to be eternally crimsoned. If they had sounder materials, they would not operate on their fellow-citizens with such tricks and artifices. They have them not, Mr. President, and desperate and hopeless must be that cause, which, to such means is driven. There is time to eradicate their poison. The antidote, truth, will dispel it; forever annihilate it. Truth and reason must triumph over error and falsehood.

Mr. President, my remarks have been addressed to the understandings and not the passions of my associates, to show them the position of the Federalists nominee of the great piebald Opposition party—"ringed, streaked, and speckled," as it is—to show it to them not by bitter vituperation and idle declamation; but to prove it by facts—facts, too, furnished by the nominee himself, by which he stands before the country, in a position in which *man never stood before*, presenting political opinions vying with the Kaleidoscope in variety. Sir, I suppose I could have acted the mock hero: blustered, looked pompous and wise; roared loud and declaimed lustily—built up a man of straw, called him Philip or Caesar, played the part of a Pausanias or a Brutus; strutted before you in tragic attitude; uttered a philippic of thunder against this monster, and exclaim, "off with his head; so much for Buckingham." I might have "marched up the hill, and then down again." All this I might have done; but, Sir, ours is not the cause to require such resorts. We have our principles as well known as the name we bear. They are written upon the mind of every Democrat in the country. We dare avow them, and by argument maintain them. We have all to gain by such a course; our opponents all to lose: hence they do not resort to it.

Sir, I feel myself most sincerely indebted to the members of the association for the patience they have exhibited and the attention they have given to my remarks. If I have succeeded in strengthening the minds of any of them, in the truth and justice of our cause, why they should select, for the office of President of the U. S., the well tried Democratic Republican, and not the Federal nominee, I shall feel gratified. Sir, let us remember that our party hurled Federalism from power in 1800; prostrated the "Reign of Terror." Will we not, in 1840, avert the attempted re-ascendancy of this very power? Are we prepared for a system of government that Alexander Hamilton himself would glory in? Let us remember, the issue in truth is between the principles of Federalism on the one hand and Republicanism on the other.

## Two Warnings from the North.

### 1. A Startling Development!

We are favored by the Rev. Mr. Clark of Fredericksburg, with the following Letter from the Rev. Mr. Abel Brown of Northampton, Mass. It will be recollected, that Mr. Brown with a moral courage, for which he deserves great credit, recently addressed a letter to Mr. Hallett of Boston, in which he exposed the manoeuvres of Messrs. W. H. Harrison, Evans, Calhoun of Mass., and Judge Morris. But the following letter contains developments of similar movements, calculated to show the excesses which the Whigs of Massachusetts are committing, to promote the election of the Federal and Abolition candidate. The "Hamden Post" of Springfield, Mass., draws the following portrait of Mr. Brown:

"REV. ABEL BROWN.—The scandalous, infamous falsehoods, the black-hearted and vile slanders and insinuations, the Federalists are secretly circulating, to blacken the character, destroy the reputation, and prostrate the influence of this gentleman, a young man of talent, strict integrity and irreproachable character; is almost without parallel in the annals of infamy. Mr. Brown is a Baptist Minister, a popular and successful preacher. At the late Abolition State Convention, he was honest and bold enough to disclose the secret operations used to foist Harrison upon the Abolitionists.

He stated to the Convention the substance of a secret letter written by Mr. Calhoun to Judge Morris, and by the latter shown and read to the Abolitionists. For revealing this, he has drawn down upon his devoted head the hottest fury of Federalism. He is charged with having been a corrupted and bought by George Bancroft, and although he has always voted the Whig ticket when he has voted at all, he is charged with being the hired emissary of Van Burenism. We have ourselves heard him pronounced a liar, and characterless, by a furious Federal Whig, smarting under the exposure of their shameless game of deception and fraud.

"But Mr. Brown is above the impotent shafts of their malice. His character is a perfect shield against their insidious assaults. Whenever the Federalists shall see fit to call on him publicly to substantiate his charges upon the moral character of General William H. Harrison, he holds himself ready for the task. He seeks no controversy with them, and asks no immunity from them. The attempt, secret and concerted, to prostrate a minister of the Gospel and poison the popular mind against him, because he will not trample on the truth, will not bow the knee to mammon and worship at their polluted shrine, is worthy of modern Federalism, decked in blue ribbons and reveling on "hard cider, made harder by hard brandy, all for the glory of Gen. Harrison"—of the cause which avoids truth, shuns light and seeks concealment and darkness, because its deeds are dark.

"Mr. Brown will continue on in the work of his divine master, unawed by threats, open or secret."

## CORRESPONDENCE.

"NORTHAMPTON, (Mass.) 21st Aug., 1840.

Mr. John Clark,

"Dear Sir:—Yours of the 17th inst., was received yesterday. I read it with pleasure, as it breathed the spirit of a gentleman and christian. You will appreciate this remark, when I tell you, that I have now before me four letters, received within a few days through the Post-office, unpaid, and filled with insults! One of them is from the Editor of the Boston Atlas, a Whig paper. It was written, evidently, for the purpose of taxing me with the postage, and insulting me at the same time—as the pretended injuries had been publicly answered, in the most definite manner, and the Editor had seen and read the letter answering the same. Another letter, is anonymous, promising me a coat of tar, feathers, &c., &c., all growing out of the causes you mention in your letter. The open frankness and honest inquiry of your letter, demand from me an answer.

"Your first inquiry respecting Gen. Harrison and the letters of members of Congress which represent him to us, Abolitionists, as desirous to do all in his power for the overthrow of slavery, has been publicly answered in my letter to Mr. Hallett. I have only to say, that my statements in that letter are not exaggerated—Gen. H. and his Northern friends have been earnestly endeavoring to obtain the votes of the Abolitionists, and have told us again and again, upon the General's authority, that he would aid to the extent of his ability in abolishing slavery. In order to gain or make sure of the votes of the numerous Abolitionists, members of Congress have written, upon the authority of Gen. H., such letters as the one described in my letter to Mr. Hallett, to distinguished men of the Whig party; they have shown those letters to a few of the prominent Abolitionists, who they supposed would tell their brethren, and thereby secure their votes. Having myself more than two years since become satisfied that Gen. Harrison was a mere tool of the party, I have watched the course of his friends among us, and have been waiting since his nomination, for facts sufficient to convince the friends of emancipation that the General was what I knew him to be. I obtained the facts, and when I thought proper, stated them; the result upon the public mind you have seen through the papers. (I perhaps should state that no consistent Abolitionist believes that he can vote for M. Van Buren, for he has openly and frankly expressed his sentiments, and his friends even here in Massachusetts do not attempt to cover them up; therefore we have no difficulty with them; they are not hypocrites.) The consequences of my telling the truth respecting the letter of Wm. B. Calhoun, have been to show the Abolitionists of this Congressional District the corruption of the man and the leaders of the party. I did not act a dishonorable part in doing this; for, the facts which I stated were not obtained clandestinely or upon a promise of secrecy, or in any manner which did not give me a perfect and honorable right to use them publicly. I did use them thus. For it, I have been scandalized and insulted in an indecent manner. I have offered to meet the Whigs through their own papers or in public discussion, and suffer them to prove me guilty of a single dishonorable act, or of prostituting the "sacred office" in the least respect in the entire transaction; but they have no wish to meet me any where or how but by the meanest abuse. Their attempted abuse consists 1st, in circulating a report that I "am a politician, under the pay of the V. Buren party." I am so far from being a politician, that I never took the least part in a political meeting, until the Abolition Convention in Boston, about the 1st of June, and did very little, even there. I have also, within ten days past, attended a political Convention, by the request of a few christian friends, long enough to read a few verses in the Bible, and pray; and the most they could say of my prayer, was, that I prayed that the Convention then convened, might "embrace and carry out the principles of the Bible; that their Democracy might be that of the Bible." I have voted only upon a few occasions, and then with the Whig party;—only erasing the names of those men whose moral



characters were doubtful. So far from being bought by Mr. V. Buren's officers, I did not know an Editor or leading man of that party, in this entire State. And I have even until within a few months believed, that what the leading Whig papers said of the Van Buren party, was true. A baser falsehood, could not have been invented. My preaching upon politics amounts to this: Usually a short time before election, I preach a sermon showing the character of the men whom God requires us to set as rulers over the people, and usually mention some of the public sins of the nation without reference to either party. I have, since I have been in this place, had occasion to rebuke carousals of one of the parties. I will state the facts, and you can judge whether I have done wrong. The leading Whigs here are usually members of the Congregational Church. They usually have a Sabbath evening caucus. A Deacon frequently presides. Other influential members make speeches; and, after the people have become excited, they go out and get in front of the office of the opposite party, and the air rings with their yells. The past Spring, a huge log cabin was reared in front of the large Congregational Church, and lined with hard cider. Through it the people passed into the church. A pitcher of hard cider was carried along the aisle, and placed upon the sacred desk. A leading and influential member of the church, (among others) mounted the platform, and there amid the shouts of the multitude, drank hard cider, and appealed to the baser passions of men, until they were ready to rush and yell for their General. Again—Upon another occasion, I was aroused at about 11 o'clock at night, by the ringing of bells and shouts of the multitude, as if the whole town was in flames. Rushing from my room, I found it was only the Whigs returning from a Convention, headed by these same religious men. This last transaction has been repeated twice or thrice, as I learn from good authority, with the exception of ringing bells. I live in a very retired part of the town, and am less disturbed than others. My political preaching is a rebuking of these public sins. I should as soon rebuke them in any other party as the Whigs; but the occasion does not exist here. I am possibly in error; but have thought, and do now think, that God required it at my hands. After such a convention as those described, I find it almost impossible to make an impression upon the minds of men favorable to Christianity; and I may as well cease preaching as to suffer the community to rush headlong into such transactions and still retain any sense of the obligations of Christianity.—The abuse consists in the 2d place: Influential men mingle among the multitude, and call me a liar and villain, and circulate "every scandalous falsehood which they can to my hurt"—meet me occasionally, when under the influence of some newspaper story, and call me every thing but an honest man. I have been treated thus by such men as the Hon. O. B. Morris and his associates in Springfield, (as proof see the paper sent herewith.) The lower class have thrown stones, &c., against me in the night. A couple of young merchants in this place met me in the public streets in this town; demanded explanation for a prayer which I offered. They swung their fists, &c., &c. The prayer was in behalf of young men who had been engaged in a public and base transaction. These men are only the agents of a few leading men in this region, who have heretofore ruled in church and State, and are in a perfect rage because they cannot always rule. You are perhaps aware, that it was this town that voted that President Edwards, the Elder, should not preach in it, simply because he would preach the truths they most needed. Since that time, (if I am rightly informed,) a certain set of men, who now are so much enraged at me, have ruled. If they said a minister must not preach thus and thus, the matter was settled—all was over. If he dared to be true to God, he must leave. This class of men have so long ruled, that they think they must always rule. And because I have been careful to rebuke their public immoralities, they have declared me out of fellowship; and because they could not frighten me, and drive me out, they now attempt to destroy my character. As a sample of their course, I will state, that they have just reported that "I am a convict from State's prison!" I care about their words, as I do about the barkings of a whiff. I hope and my prayer to God, is, that they may be converted.

"It would be impossible for me to tell all that is said, or done by them. I cannot make an appointment in other towns, without these men sending word before I get there, that I am any thing but what I profess to be. I see the last Springfield Gazette, holds me up to public odium, and as proof that I deserve it, states two falsehoods. I do not suppose that these men generally intend to lie, but their cause they think, demands such efforts. "Amid all these tumults, I have peace within, and God's blessing without. I have always been permitted to see sinners converted wherever I have preached.—This field is considered the hardest in Massachusetts, yet, amid all the tumult since I came here, (five months ago,) the Baptist Congregation has trebled, and the Church has more than doubled, and others are now waiting for baptism. Your Brother in Christ,

ABEL BROWN, JR."

## RICHMOND, Va., WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 9.

"A wise and frugal Government which shall restrain men from injuring one another; shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement; and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government.—MR. JEFFERSON'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

The Log Cabin, Hard Cider, Poor Man's Candidate—  
"Family pride will secure the Vote of Virginia for Harrison."

"Be thou a spirit of health or goblin damn'd,  
Bring with thee airs from heaven or blasts from hell—  
Be thy intents wicked or charitable,  
Thou comest in such a questionable shape,  
That I will speak to thee."

The Janus-faced candidate of the Whigs is ever all things to all men. At one moment, a poor backwoodsman, the tenant of a log cabin, he appeals to the sympathies of the poor and the humble; the next moment, it is but presto change, and he ushers forth in all the pomp and circumstance of ancestral pride, hereditary wealth and powerful connexions. The log cabin and hard cider mummery, so much relied on by his party, would induce belief, that their candidate was one, who, born in the humblest station of society, had earned his way to greatness, by his own unaided merit and exertions. We naturally expect to find in the story of the life of him to whom such epithets are applied, a splendid illustration of our Republican institutions—inciting, by its example, merit, however humble and lowly connected, to aspire to office and distinction. Woful disappointment will take the place of these pleasing expectations, when we come to a close scrutiny of his life.—We shall find, that no man in America has been so much indebted for his rise in life to adventitious circumstances and family connexion, as this poor man's candidate. His letter to Mr. Lyons, Elector for this District, of itself, is enough to convince us, that for his appointment to office, his promotion and continuance in office, he was mainly, if not entirely, indebted to the merits of his father, and the influence of his powerful and talented relations in Congress. With other men, the start in life is the great obstacle in the way of advancement; with him, this obstacle was removed by partial friends. Other men have to serve their fellow-citizens in humble stations, before they are put over their heads to govern them—Harrison first governed his fellow-citizens, and then served them. At the offset of life, he owed every thing to family connexion, and now at its close, Virginia family pride is appealed to and invoked to raise him to the Presidency. A pretty poor man's candidate this! A beautiful illustration of the even-handed justice of our Republican institutions!—This attempt of the stockjobbing Aristocracy who nominated Harrison, to invoke to their aid the family pride of Virginia, and to pass off their candidate as the peculiar friend of the poor, is something nearly akin to political pilfering. But the family pride of Virginia is not the low and grovelling spirit which these folks take it to be. Family pride, if it exists among us, is a feeling which is ever ready to sacrifice ease, fortune, nay, life itself, on the altar of patriotism; but which has not a single obligation to offer at the shrine of selfishness. The connexions of Harrison have too much just pride and self-respect to permit their party positions to be influenced by his nomination.

Our readers will recognize in the following fragment, the sum and substance, in part, of the numerous Speeches delivered at Whig festivals of late:

Fellow-citizens—When I look upon the assemblage before me—when I view the preparations for this festival—when I behold the givers of the feast and those invited to partake of it, associating upon kind and almost equal terms, memory involuntarily carries me back to the days of ancient Rome. In you, whose noble generosity has provided this ample board, I recognize the grave and noble patricians, the Patres Conscripti of the Commonwealth. In the innumerable host who surround you, methinks I see the Plebs; the Clientes of Rome—the brawny limbs and rough hands that composed her legions and conquered the world. When I see such patriotic condescension on the eve of a great election, exhibited by the choice spirits of the land; when I see so much love, reverence and gratitude beaming in the countenances of the people, I feel assured that this, our America, with such materials to lead her on to conquest and to glory, must some day rival, nay, surpass, even Rome herself. Sirs, I almost see, in anticipation of the glorious future, that happy day when the whole people shall be fed and clothed, not only at festivals, but throughout the year, by the bountiful dispensations of men like those who have provided this feast; when the cares and troubles attending the possession of property shall no longer disturb and corrode the minds of the mass of the people, but the voluntary donations of the wealthy and the noble, shall anticipate and supply the wants of all. What can be more wicked, what can be more diabolical, than the attempt of our political adversaries to excite distrust and discontent among the people, and to urge them on to pry into the sacred arcana of Government? What is it to you, fellow-citizens, provided you are well fed and well clothed, whether we have a Bank or no Bank; a Tariff or no Tariff, Internal Improvements or no Internal Improvements? Believe me, "the sacred stream of human happiness" will flow on alike, whether these things are instituted or not. But you know nothing of the propriety or impropriety of these measures, and are content to leave them to the management of those who alone understand them. Rely upon it, that although Gen. Harrison has too much moral dignity of character to court the vulgar approbation by pledges and promises, he has sufficiently exposed to his friends and connexions, and to the enlightened politicians of the country, the measures he intends to pursue. When you see so many men, better informed and more capable of judg-

ing than yourselves, sustaining Gen. Harrison, I know you will bestow on him a generous confidence, and not require of him to answer questions which you would not understand when answered. No, fellow-citizens, God and Nature never designed, that the poor laborer should pass judgment on the learned politician; that the wisdom of the rulers of this Republic should be controlled by the ignorance and folly of those who understand nothing of the nature of the very Government under which they live. Look at the horrors of the French Revolution, and see written in letters of blood, the consequences of this inversion of the laws of Nature, this violation of the will of God.—It is an old saying, and true as it is old, "put a beggar on horse back and he'll ride to the Devil." The Loco Focos are now riding full tilt in that direction.—Like the Jacobins of Revolutionary France, they are exciting discontent among the people, making them pry into the opinions of all candidates, inciting them to direct and control the acts of their representatives, and even attempting to bring all men down to the dead level of equal ignorance and poverty, by gradually getting rid of monied corporations, those nurseries of every thing that is polite, exclusive and noble among us—those Athenian schools, where our future orators, soldiers and statesmen are to receive their educations. With what princely munificence do these corporations reward literary and professional merit! Look to your Senate Chamber, and see how many of your eminent statesmen have received salaries and fees from them, more liberal than even princes bestow. In Congress hall, how many distinguished members have had their sinking fortunes propped and stayed by their accommodations?—The conductors of the Press, too; what liberal patronage have they received from them! what kind, disinterested aid in the day of need! Throughout the country, thousands of lawyers and officers of these corporations are fed and maintained in a style becoming their liberal patrons. Indeed, our parsimonious Government does so little to reward merit, that but for the incitements to genius offered by these institutions, we should have no aristocracy among us, and all men would sink down to one common level of hopeless, endless ignorance and poverty.—[The orator was proceeding at this rate, one might suppose, when a cider cask exploded, and blew up the cabin. If we should come across another fragment, we will print it.]

Vermont.—The Whigs have carried the State by an increased majority. They claim the five members of Congress—and the Governor (Jenison) is re-elected by an augmented vote.

## FEDERAL ABUSE OF PATRONAGE.

As the Whig asks "emphatic attention" to the passage in the letter of the President of the Bank of Virginia, in which he refers to the "abuse of patronage," and makes the assertion, that the Whigs, "wherever they have had the power, have, without compunction, swept off every officeholder, however low, who did not implicitly obey their dictation," we have been induced to examine somewhat into the matter to see how far the sweet, amiable, office-hating Whigs were blameless of the charge made against them, and the following is the result of our investigation. We would, however, premise, that the "signal liberality and forbearance" extended towards the President "himself," will of course be regarded by the Whig, in its profound conception of the weight of testimony, as a full discharge against the numerous acts of proscription arrayed against its party in other States of the Union:

First then, What says the Trenton True American, in answer to the Washington Globe, asking for information as to how far the Whigs had conformed their practices to their precepts, after they attained the ascendancy in that State, a few years ago?

"The answer lies in a nutshell. They have swept the board, from the office of Governor and Chancellor, down to the meanest town officer. They have almost literally cut off every head in which a drop of Democratic blood flowed. If there have been exceptions, they have been in cases where they had nobody of their own party to appoint, or stumbled upon a Democrat by mistake. Yes, there is one exception. The keeper of the State prison was so strongly fortified by his extraordinary fitness and success in office, and backed by a religious influence so powerful that the leaders thought it policy to spare him, yet this single deviation from the prescribed track, has occasioned two or three 'indignant meetings' among them, and a great deal of invective against what they call the pusillanimous cowardice of these leaders."

2d. How was it in Pennsylvania? Ritner was elected in December, 1835, and in May, 1836, had removed every Democrat from office in the State. Hear what the Pennsylvanian said!

"The Washington Globe asks for information as to the extent of proscription for opinion's sake, exercised by the Whig party in Philadelphia. In reply, it is perhaps unnecessary to go into particulars, for the aforesaid proscription was exercised upon a principle of the most sweeping generality. For instance, in 1832, when the Whig party gained the upper hand in the city of Philadelphia, and found the offices held by Democrats, they did not spare a single man. In the course of that year, and the one ensuing, every Democrat was swept out, whether his office was high or low, the very watchmen being subjected to the operation as inexorably as those who held places of value. In fact, the treatment of the watchmen was more severe, if possible, than that which fell to the share of the other elected parties; for, they were all discharged in midwinter, when it was impossible for them to procure employment. So much for city matters.

"In the State, upon the accession of Joseph Ritner, the same course of action was followed. The support of Thaddeus Stevens was one of the chief requisites for obtaining a contract, and he who splits wood for a locomotive, was suffered to split no more, if he would not bow to Gexler's cap. Proscription was carried to the utmost extent. No one was so humble as to escape it. How many Democrats did Whiggery dismiss from Pennsylvania? The answer is brief and comprehensive. BY ALL."

3d. In Connecticut, the removals for opinion's sake were just as sweeping as in Pennsylvania.



### Removals in one year by the Federalists of Connecticut.

30 Judges of County Courts—all but 4 in the State.  
47 Judges of Probate Courts—all the Democrats within reach.  
3 Directors of the State Prison.  
300 Justices of the Peace—every Democrat.  
1 Quartermaster-General.  
50 All the Democratic Auditors of Accounts, State Directors in Banks, and the Bank Commissioners.  
500 (At least) Commissioners of Roads, Bridges, Ferries, &c., &c.

### 621 removals in one year in a single State.

4th. We come now to the great State of New York, and how is the fact here? The Albany Argus, in reply to the Globe, publishes a list of the officers removed, and the office from which they were removed. Here is the list—Read it, freemen; read and see what is to be expected from Gen. Harrison and his friends, if they get into power:

"Political Removals and Appointments.—Besides the large number of removals and appointments attempted and perfected at the last session of the Legislature—the State officers, the clerkships and deputies in the State offices, &c., and the clerks in the public offices and the officers of the Senate at the present session, the following is a list of the political appointments made thus far, (21st February, 1840), since the meeting of the present Legislature, by the Governor and Senate:

County Judges	36	Notaries Public	34
Com. of Loans	109	Inspect. of beef and pork	23
Surrogates	28	Justices of the Peace	23
Flour Inspectors	5	Messengers of grain	16
Inspectors of sole leather	18	Cullers of staves, &c.	1
Com. of Roads	39	Weighers general of mer-	4
Masters in Chancery	53	chandise	
Examiners in do.	40	Health officer	1
Supreme Court Com.	37	Clerk of State prison	1
Inspectors of Lumber	22	Port Wardens	3
Do. pot and pearl ashes	2	Harbor master	1
Do. of green hides, &c.	4	Ins. of distilled spirits	5
Do. State prison	1	Measurer of stone	3
Do. of Salt	4	Do. of wood	1
Sup't on salt works	1	Commissioners of Lewis-	2
Assistant State sander	1	ton school fund	
Canal Commissioners	5	Bank Commissioner	1
Canal appraisers	2	Health Commissioner	1
Bank directors	2	Inspector of flax seed	1

"Five hundred and ten party appointments and removals in 40 days—or an average of 42 on each executive day."

### "Federal Removals in the State of New York.

"Every officer on the canals  
Other removals and attempted removals by the Governor and Canal Board (not including clerks in the offices)

349  
Federal removals in 60 days  
"Again, in Connecticut, the 'proscriptive' hand of Federalism, has been not less busy than in this State. Having had the full power, it even far exceeds its extent of intolerance here. Thus we have, in the Hartford Times, a list, of which the following is a summary, of the Federal removals for one year.

"Aggregate Federal Removals in two States.  
New York, in 60 days, 240  
Connecticut, in one year, 621  
870"

We might go in this way in every State where the Whigs have had either a permanent or accidental foothold—but, as the facts stated have never been denied, it is useless to pursue them further. Their only defence against the odium they justly excite, in gratifying without remorse, so voracious a rapacity, is the old cry of "wolf," "wolf"—proscription, against the Administration—a charge, as illiberal as it is false.

Now, where is the justice or reasonableness for this wholesale work of proscription for opinion's sake? Is it to be found in the conduct of the late or present administrations? No, it is not. Gen. Jackson, it is true, did make removals—so did Mr. Jefferson; and the reason was obvious why they removed more than their predecessors. Each of the preceding administrations was the friend of his predecessor in office, and supported the measures of his Administration, and consequently, there was no necessity for removal. When Jefferson and Jackson, however, came into power, they found all the offices in possession of their enemies, who had resorted to foul and disreputable means to defeat their elections—for instance, Jefferson dismissed those who patronized Poreupine's Gazette, conducted by Wm. Cobbett; because, that paper had propagated against him the vilest calumnies and basest slanders. Jackson dismissed those who had encouraged the authors of the false, scandalous and malicious charges against him in the newspapers, pamphlets and coffin handbills of the day. These dismissals were necessary to a successful administration of public affairs, and made in strict conformity to a principle laid down by Washington during his administration. What said that great man?

"I shall not, whilst I have the honor to administer the Government, bring a man into any office of consequence, knowingly, whose political tenets are adverse to the measures which the General Government is pursuing; for this, in my opinion, would be a sort of political suicide. That it would embarrass its movements, is most certain."

But, Mr. Van Buren has made no removals from office for opinion's sake—the word of his competitor to the contrary notwithstanding. Mr. Van Rensselaer was dismissed because of his advanced age and physical incompetency to attend to the duties of Postmaster at Albany, and Mr. Flagg, Comptroller of the State, a faithful and efficient officer, substituted, who had been for opinion sake proscribed by the Governor of N. York, immediately after his election. The removals by Mr. Van Buren have been very few, and in every case for cause. But if he had been disposed to act out the rule to the same extent practised by the Whigs, and for which he is nevertheless blamed, what a fine field he had before him! 'what game' what sport for the marks-

man! He could scarcely have pointed his gun in any direction, without bringing down a *bat* or a *lark*; but he has not done so—the one, is still the tenant of the rusty walls of the Treasury, and the other, ever and anon, is seen flitting in the sunbeams of Executive patronage. Here is an unofficial table furnished at the request of a member of Congress showing the relative number of Whigs and Democrats in the offices at Washington, with the respective and aggregate relative amount they receive:

OFFICES.	Federalists.	Amount.	Democrats.	Amount.
Land office,	50	\$56,200 48	56	\$56,950
General Post Office,	11	14,600 48	11	65,980
Auditor's Office,	25	31,200 30	25	38,075
Treasury Department,	10	12,000 15	10	19,450
Register's Office,	24	27,05 00		
First Comptroller's Office,	13	12,250 4		7,500
Second Comptroller's Office,	9	12,500 2		1,953
First Auditor's Office,	5	4,500 11		14,400
Second Auditor's Office,	14	15,900 5		5,900
Fourth Auditor's Office,	8	9,700 8		10,503
Fifth Auditor's Office,	8	11,700 1		1,150
Treasurer's Office,	3	11,750 3		3,200
Solicitor's Office,	3	2,800 2		4,650
State Department,	10	37,800 4		10,385
Aggregate,		\$329,065		\$339,140
		\$29,140		
		\$29,925		

In favor of Federalists,  
Here is a correspondence between Dr. Duncan and Mr. Kendall, who was then Postmaster-General, showing the number of Postmasters in the U. S., with their political preferences, compensation, &c.:

"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, January 17, 1839.  
"Dear Sir: If not inconsistent with any rule you may have laid down for your official or political conduct, I would be pleased if you would inform me—  
"1st. Of the number of Postmasters in the United States.  
"2d. The aggregate amount of salary they receive in the year.  
"3d. What proportion of them are supporters of the present Administration.  
"Should it not be in your power to answer this last interrogatory with accuracy, inform me what you suppose to be the probable number. I am yours, with high respect,  
"A. DUNCAN.

"HON. A. KENDALL, Postmaster-General.  
To this communication, Mr. Duncan received the following answer:

"WASHINGTON, January 17, 1839.  
"Sir: I perceive no objection to answering unofficially your letter of the 10th inst. I, therefore, annex replies to your several interrogatories.  
"1. 'What number of Postmasters there are in the U. States?'  
"The number of Postmasters in the U. S., on the 1st day of December last, was 12,553.  
"2. 'The aggregate amount of salary they receive in the year?'  
"The compensation of Postmasters for the year ending 30th June, 1838, varied little from \$21,034.  
"3. 'What proportion of them are supporters and friends of the present Administration?'  
"I have not information which will enable me to classify the Postmasters politically. Although, in making appointments, the friends of the Administration are preferred to enemies, when their politics are known, there are many cases in which the Department has no information on the subject, and it institutes no inquiries into the politics of incumbents. It is believed, however, that more than half the Postmasters of the U. S. are politically opposed to the Administration.  
"With high respect, your ob't serv't,  
"AMOS KENDALL.

"HON. A. DUNCAN."  
And here is another table taken from the speech of another member of Congress, showing the number of Removals under each Administration from the origin of the Government—from which it appears, that but forty removals took place during the first three years of Mr. Van Buren's administration. Should not this fact put to shame all those (and especially Gen. Harrison) who are making such an outcry against him, for removing so many for opinion's sake?

"Mr. Speaker, I would call attention to the facts contained in a message from the President, in answer to a resolution requesting lists of officers who derive their appointments from the President and Senate, and who have been dismissed from office since the 3d of March, 1789, up to the 3d of March, 1840. Out of those whose commissions are recorded in the office of the Secretary of State, embracing most of the higher officers, the following number of removals have been made, to wit:

Van Buren, 3 years.	10
Jackson, 8 years.	7
Monroe, 8 years.	50
Madison, 8 years.	16
Jefferson, 8 years.	17
Adams, 4 years.	5
Washington, 8 years.	85

Army officers removed by order of the President, 3  
Navy officers removed by order of the President, 94  
Marine corps, 24  
Those whose commissions have been recorded in the Treasury Office since 1833; the records before that time were burnt, 7  
"Since the 2d day of July, 1836, a large class of Postmasters receive their appointments from the President and Senate, of which class there have been removed by Mr. Van Buren thirteen."

What will the Whig say to this?  
The Whigs claim credit for not having carried the work of proscription as far in this State, as it has been carried in others. They made the attempt, and partially succeeded—Witness the case of Ritchie and Daniel, in

the session of '34-5; witness their attempts since. The reason is, that they have never had the power so far as to venture a general sweep.

The author of the Fauquier address, No. 2, as far as he treats of the militia bill of Mr. Poinsett, has managed his subject with considerable ingenuity. He shows a clear and intimate knowledge of the whole subject, and *knows*, as well as any man, in Christendom, that Mr. Van Buren had never recommended a standing army of 300,000, or even the plan of Mr. Poinsett, which he says is unconstitutional. So far as he argues that the "heads," as set forth in Mr. Poinsett's report to the President, are worse than the "details," as reported to Congress the 30th of March thereafter, we are sure he must have been in *just*, and was merely trying his capacity for mystification. After all, it is mere talk—a multiplication of words based on false postulates. These very "heads," so much worse than the "details," in the conception of the Fauquier writer, were warmly and enthusiastically approved by many of his own party and several of his leading newspaper organs. Among the latter may be enumerated the Baltimore Patriot, who said: "If the reader were kept from a knowledge of the writer of it, he would infer that it was the production of some liberal and enlightened Whig"—"that there was not a particle of Loco Foco Demagoguism in it," &c. The New York Journal of Commerce approved it in very high terms—So did the New York Commercial Advertiser and the New York American—all journals of high standing with the Whigs, and must be regarded as fair exponents of Whig sentiment on any subject in which they concur. Yet the Fauquier writer argues that it is worse than Mr. Poinsett's detailed plan. Which are we to believe? and which is entitled to the most weight, when we are met with such high authority on both sides of a question?

What does O. K. stand for at the head of the Vermont elections in the Richmond Whig? We have been puzzling our head about it, and the thought has come over our mind that it must be for Our King! which in future may be regarded as the battle-cry of the British Whigs, stimulated and emboldened as they have been by a few equivocal and partial successes. When it is remembered that Vermont was one of the States represented in the Hartford Convention, and in favor of a New England Monarchy during the late war with the Duke of Kent at its head, we confess that O. K. has excited an interest we would like to have gratified by a satisfactory explanation.

The Croghan Correspondence has appeared, and is highly creditable to General Harrison. It shows that he has been capable of disparaging the services of a gallant officer in McAfee's History—of promising to do justice in the premises, and then of utterly disregarding the promise.

Mr. Legare of South Carolina spoke last night in the Log Cabin. We confess we had a curiosity to gratify in seeing and hearing the man who had rendered himself so notorious by his *learned* displays in opposition to the Independent Treasury, and in behalf of "black broth and iron money"—but circumstances denied us the opportunity. The idea we have of him is, that he is a chaste and accomplished gentleman, with nothing of the ranting Bobadil, like his predecessor, Preston. We venture to say, that he did not talk about revolution, or killing people, if Mr. Van Buren was re-elected—that he did not call him weazel, fool and grimalkin; but, that he said a great deal to suit the political party he was addressing, cannot be doubted, from the desperation and recklessness one may well imagine to actuate a man who has been discomfited and frowned upon by his own constituency. By the by, the Whigs talk a great deal about Mr. Van Buren's attention to those whom the people have discarded, yet they pick up every out-cast, down to Baer, the swindler, and carry them about to enlighten the public mind. What consistency!

We regret to learn that the bridge over the North Anna river on the railroad between this and Fredericksburg was destroyed by fire on Monday night last. The train from Fredericksburg passed it early in the night, and it is said that several gentlemen passed it afterwards, and saw no appearance of fire. It was burnt, however, some time during the night, and the belief is, it must have been the act of an incendiary. This belief is strengthened by the fact, that on two occasions lately, the locomotives have been thrown off the track not very distant from this bridge—once by a log of wood, and again by breaking the lock at one of the turn-outs and turning the *switch* across the track.

We are happy to learn, that the Company was fortunate enough to procure an engine in Fredericksburg, and that a temporary causeway was yesterday erected between the abutments of the burnt bridge, by means of which, the train came in a little after its regular hour last night. No interruption in the travel or the mail need then be expected, beyond a reasonable detention at the bridge, in transferring the passengers, mail, baggage, &c., from one set of cars to another. For this almost incredible activity of the Company, the public cannot but return many thanks, though they pay their money.

We regret, that our office arrangements, and the space we have necessarily devoted to the Southern Address, (a paper of the first importance in the present crisis), will not allow us to publish the whole of Mr. Watson's Speech in the Crisis. We must be content with the following extracts, touching the Veto Power, Dangers of a Public Debt, the Hooe Case, Ogle's Speech and the Census, and referring those of our readers to the Enquirer of the 1st and 4th inst., who may desire to see a clear and well-condensed view of Gen. Harrison's two sets of opinions on the political topics of the day.

The members of the Committee to make Arrangements for the District Convention of the 23d September are requested to meet at Democratic Hall, on Monday next, at 4 o'clock, P. M. The following gentlemen compose the Committee:—Washington Greenhow, J. H. Christian, Clement White, Wm. Wallace, R. O. Haskins, Peter Elmore, John Womble, Joseph Woodson, Doctor M. George, Francis Wicker, J. F. Keenan, John Henry, and Thomas Pemberton.

### WASHINGTON GREENHOW, Chm'n.

The Republican Corresponding Committee for the county of Henrico, will also meet at the same time and place, for the purpose indicated in the foregoing notice. The punctual attendance of every member is requested.—The committee consists of the following gentlemen:—Benj. B. Barker, Jas. M. Selden, Chas. L. McCool, Jackson Childrey, Jno. O. Mosby, Henry Cox, John O. Goddin, Jas. Hill, Richard Jeffries, Jno. Carter.  
PHILIP MAYO, Chairman.